

# Exhibit 2

JOSEF D. COOPER (53015)  
TRACY R. KIRKHAM (69912)  
JOHN D. BOGDANOV (215830)  
COOPER & KIRKHAM, P.C.  
357 Tehama Street, Second Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Telephone: (415) 788-3030  
Facsimile: (415) 882-7040  
[jdc@coopkirk.com](mailto:jdc@coopkirk.com)  
[trk@coopkirk.com](mailto:trk@coopkirk.com)  
[jdb@coopkirk.com](mailto:jdb@coopkirk.com)

FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA (41059)  
PATRICK B. CLAYTON (240191)  
LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA  
456 Montgomery Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 788-7210  
Facsimile: (415) 788-0706  
[fos@scarpullalaw.com](mailto:fos@scarpullalaw.com)  
[pbc@scarpullalaw.com](mailto:pbc@scarpullalaw.com)

*Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION.

**Master File No. 3:07-cv-5944 JST**

**MDL No. 1917**

This Document Relates to:

All Indirect-Purchaser Actions

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STRIKE  
RELATING TO COOPER & KIRKHAM,  
P.C.'S DECEMBER 9, 2015, JANUARY 5,  
2016 AND JANUARY 8, 2016 FILINGS**

Judge: Honorable Jon S. Tigar

Before: Special Master Martin Quinn, JAMS

1           Lead Counsel has moved “to strike *references in Cooper & Kirkham, P.C.’s* (“Cooper &  
2 Kirkham”) December 9, 2015, January 5, 2016 and January 8, 2016 *filings* suggesting that Steven  
3 Ganz (their client and a court-appointed class representative for the State of California) is an  
4 objector.”<sup>1</sup> The concise and precise answer to this motion is that there are no “references in” these  
5 “filings” that “suggest,” state or imply that Steven Ganz individually is an objector.

6           Indeed, upon reading the Motion to Strike, one discovers that actually it is not directed to  
7 the content of any filing, as Lead Counsel concedes that “[t]he bodies of these filings *do not* state  
8 that they are being filed on behalf of Mr. Ganz.” *Ibid* (emphasis added). Rather, the motion is  
9 directed to the content of what are most likely computer-generated JAMS or Case Anywhere  
10 emails that give notice that a filing was uploaded to the JAMS Case Anywhere website. Lead  
11 Counsel never explains what possible legal significance such emails could carry that justifies the  
12 time and energy that has been and will be expended by counsel and the Special Master to  
13 adjudicate this motion.

14           Cooper & Kirkham is not “surreptitiously through the Case Anywhere filing system,” or in  
15 any other manner “attempting to assert . . . that Mr. Ganz is now objecting to the settlements.” *Id.*  
16 at 2. Cooper & Kirkham is simply employing the designated filing protocol for submitting  
17 documents to the Special Master. Moreover, Cooper & Kirkham cannot directly affect the content  
18 of the automated emails at issue. We know because we have tried. As detailed in the Declaration  
19 of John D. Bogdanov filed concurrently herewith, Cooper & Kirkham followed the same  
20 procedure for each of its filings with Case Anywhere, and none of the steps necessary to file a  
21 document with JAMS involves inserting Mr. Ganz’s name or the designation, “Objector,” in any  
22 field in the Case Anywhere system. See, Bogdanov Declaration<sup>2</sup> at ¶¶ 2 - 9.

23  
24  
25 <sup>1</sup> “Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Relating to Cooper & Kirkham, P.C.’s December 9, 2015,  
January 5, 2016 and January 8, 2016 Filings,” filed January 9, 2016 (“Motion to Strike”) at p. 1.

26 <sup>2</sup> “Declaration of John D. Bogdanov in Support of Opposition to Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs’ Motion to  
27 Strike Relating to Cooper & Kirkham, P.C.’s December 9, 2015, January 5, 2016 and January 8, 2016  
Filings,” filed concurrently herewith.

1           However, as Mr. Bogdanov relates, “[s]ometime between December 9 and December 14,  
 2 2015,” he noticed that the “Document Submission Confirmation” for the December 9, 2015 filing  
 3 “contained a reference that my firm was ‘Representing’ ‘Steven Ganz (Objector),’ rather than the  
 4 ‘Indirect Purchaser Class Plaintiffs’ regarding these filings.” *Id.* at ¶10. Mr. Bogdanov then  
 5 attempted unsuccessfully to locate a window on the Case Anywhere system that would provide  
 6 him with an “interface in order to change this designation.” *Ibid.* On December 14, 2015, he  
 7 telephoned Case Anywhere Customer Support, and, *inter alia*, requested that the Case Anywhere  
 8 service list be changed to “indicate ‘Indirect Purchaser Class Plaintiffs’ in the ‘Representing’ field  
 9 for [his] firm, rather than ‘Steven Ganz.’” *Id.* at ¶11. However, Mr. Bogdanov was told that “it  
 10 was not possible for [him] to change this field online,” nor could the change be made by a  
 11 representative of Case Anywhere. Rather, “authorization for such a change must originate from a  
 12 Case Manager at JAMS.” *Ibid.*

13           Later that day, Mr. Bogdanov telephoned Ms. Sandra Chan, the JAMS Case Manager for  
 14 this action, and explained to her the problem with the “Representing” field on the service emails  
 15 from Case Anywhere. *Id.* at ¶12. He told her that he had been informed by Case Anywhere  
 16 customer support that the change he wanted to make from “Steven Ganz” to “Indirect Purchaser  
 17 Class Plaintiffs” could only be made if authorized by a Case Manager at JAMS, and requested that  
 18 Ms. Chan contact Case Anywhere. *Ibid.* Ms. Chan said that she would inform Case Anywhere to  
 19 make the change per Mr. Bogdanov’s request. *Ibid.* Apparently, the requested change had not  
 20 been effectuated when the January 5 and 8 emails were filed.

21           This motion is paranoid at best and frivolous at worst. Everyone understands that it is  
 22 Lead Counsel’s position that Cooper & Kirkham’s objections, authorities and argument should be  
 23 disregarded because the firm was not appointed Lead Counsel, and therefore lacks standing to  
 24 raise issues on behalf of Indirect Purchaser Class Plaintiffs or absent class members.<sup>3</sup> However,  
 25 \_\_\_\_\_

26 <sup>3</sup> Had Cooper & Kirkham filed objections on behalf of Mr. Ganz individually, we expect that Lead  
 27 Counsel would have taken the position that being a consumer from California, Mr. Ganz could not show  
 28 personal injury from either obtaining releases from uncompensated non-repealer state purchasers, or the

as we have said before, class action settlement approval is not an arena in which “shoot the messenger” can be a winning strategy for defeating the message. Indeed, insofar as there is even a contest here, the “winner” is pre-decided – the absent members of the classes whom the Court, and by extension, the Special Master, are obligated to protect. This motion should be denied.

Dated: January 13, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Josef D. Cooper  
Josef D. Cooper

Josef D. Cooper (53015)  
Tracy R. Kirkham (69912)  
John D. Bogdanov (215830)  
COOPER & KIRKHAM, P.C.  
357 Tehama Street, Second Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Telephone: (415) 788-3030  
Facsimile: (415) 882-7040  
Email: [jdc@coopkirk.com](mailto:jdc@coopkirk.com)

/s/ Francis O. Scarpulla  
Francis O. Scarpulla

Francis O. Scarpulla (41059)  
Patrick B. Clayton (240191)  
LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA  
456 Montgomery Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: 415-788-7210  
Facsimile: 415-788-0706  
[fos@scarpullalaw.com](mailto:fos@scarpullalaw.com)

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the above signatories.

exclusion of resellers from the Chunghwa distribution, and therefore, lacks standing to raise those issues.